Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Did the Magistrate give notice before local inspection?

President.—No notice was given. It was made in the presence of the complainants. No further notice was necessary at the time.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—So he went for local inspection without giving notice?

President.—That is a comment and it is not permissible.

Regarding Chittur Municipality.

133. Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—Will the Government be pleased to state in connection with the article 'Chittur (Palghat) Municipality' in *the Hindu* of 10th October 1927:—

(1) did the Diwan interview the Councillors who had petitioned to him;

(2) was it not represented to him by Mr. R. Subrahmanya Ayyar and his vakil that they were prepared to substantiate all the allegations contained in the memorial;

(3) had the Diwan any first-hand information that the person who contested the seat with the Chairman had any prime hand in the memorial;

(4) did the Diwan inspect personally to know that the misappropriations spoken of in the memorial were either exaggerated or untrue;

(5) who had the speaking during the interview;

(6) did the interviewer speak or only nod to what the Diwan had said;

(7) what were the data on which seeing the works the Diwan came to the conclusion that the Chairman worked with disinterested motives all along in spite of the memorialisation to the contrary?

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—(1) The Diwan might have given the interview.

(2) Might have represented, but no written note has been made about it.

(3) If the Member means by 'first-hand information' information furnished directly by the person who contested the seat with the present Chairman, the answer is 'no'.

(4) It is not understood what the Member means by this question. Whatever enquiry was considered by the Diwan necessary to decide the matter was duly made.

(5) There was speaking on both sides.

(6) The interviewer took part in speaking; the Diwan did not pay attention as to whether he nodded or made any other gestures.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(7) No written record has been made by the Diwan about the details of the inspection. The question was one of general impression and the Diwan was satisfied of the proper execution of the works.

Concession to salt contractor Mr. Arunachalam Chettiyar.

134. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state the date, the purport and the orders of the Government on each of the petitions submitted by Mr. Arunachalam Chettiyar, the late salt contractor, during the last five years for the grant of some concession or other referred to in the answer to question No. 204 of the budget session of 1101?

Mr. V. B. Vaidyanatha Ayyar.—

Date	Purport	Order
1. 21— 7—1098 and 2. 7— 2—1099	Requesting compensation for losses sustained by him in 1097 and 1098.	A sum of Rs. 26,933-12-0 was allowed towards a portion of the losses in 1098. The matter has not however been finally disposed of and it has been ordered that any further compensation for losses in 1098 would be considered on the production of satisfactory evidence of loss by the contractor.
3. 30— 1—1100	Representing that his losses have not been fully compensated for and requesting to extend to him the patronage shown to other contractors and to pay him the amounts due on account of difference between the cost price and selling price and to repay the amounts with held from him previously.	The petitioner was told that on the information then furnished by him, the Diwan would not be justified in modifying or relaxing the terms of the petitioner's legal contract.
4. 31— 2—1100	Submitting the audit report and the balance sheet of his business up to the end of 1098 and requesting a reconsideration of the orders passed.	The petitioner was asked to submit his profit and loss statements for the several years during which he had been a contractor.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly